UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

EUGENE FORTE,

Plaintiff

v.

TOMMY JONES,

Defendant.

postdate the city council meeting of May 7, 2008.

CASE NO. 1:11-CV-0718 AWI-BAM

ORDER SETTING DATE FOR DEFENDANT'S REPSONSE TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION IN LIMINE, DOCUMENT NUMBER 152

Amended Complaint" (hereinafter, Plaintiff's "Motion"). Doc # 152. The primary purpose of Plaintiff's Motion is to clarify Plaintiff's intentions with regard to the scope of Defendant's conduct that constitutes the alleged infringement of Plaintiff's rights under the First Amendment and therefore should inform the jury's consideration of damages. It is the court's understanding, based on Plaintiff's Motion and on comments made during the hearing on motions in limine, that it is Plaintiff contends that all the negative interactions between Plaintiff and Defendant, including those that were described in Plaintiff's first and second claims for relief that have been dismissed, are all examples of retaliation by Defendant against Plaintiff motivated by Plaintiff's exercise of his free speech rights. It is therefore Plaintiff's contention that both evidence of both retaliation

On May 23, 2014, Plaintiff filed a "Motion in Limine For Clerical Clarification of Second

Although Plaintiff's motion also requests clarification of rulings during the hearing on a number of motions in limine and seeks reconsideration of the court's refusal to disqualify itself

and damage are to be found in Defendant's actions regarding Plaintiff that both predate and

from the proceedings, the court requests that Defendant not address these issues and confine any further briefing to the issue mentioned in the first paragraph of this order. It is hereby ORDERED that Defendant may file and serve any response to the issue discussed in the first paragraph of this order not later than 5:00 p.m. Thursday, May 29, 2014. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: May 27, 2014 SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE